

1 HONORABLE RICHARD A. JONES
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

10 AR PILLOW INC., et al.,
11
12 Plaintiffs,
13 v.
14 ANNETTE COTTRELL,
15 Defendant.

CASE NO. C11-1962 RAJ

ORDER GRANTING MOTION
TO WITHDRAW AND MOTION
FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

This matter comes before the court on counsel for plaintiffs AR Pillow, Inc.'s and Elizabeth Goutevenier's motion to withdraw as counsel and motion for extension of time. Dkt. # 64. Ms. Goutevenier and new counsel for plaintiffs (who have not yet appeared) have also filed letters requesting an extension of time to respond to defendants' Rule 37 motion. Dkt. # 67, # 69. New counsel also requests additional time to respond to defendants' motion for attorney's fees, to file a reply in support of plaintiffs' motion for attorney's fees, and to file a motion for summary judgment. Dkt. # 69.

With respect to the motion to withdraw as counsel, defendants object to allowing withdrawal because plaintiffs do not meet "GR2 (g)" requirements. This District revised the local rules on December 1, 2012, and the "General Rules" are no longer in force. Rather, Local Civil Rule ("LCR") 83.1(b) governs withdrawal. Although counsel for

1 plaintiffs, Eric Helmy, cites to his declaration, no declaration was filed in connection with
2 the motion to withdraw. Nevertheless, Mr. Helmy represents that plaintiffs directed Mr.
3 Helmy and his firm to withdraw as counsel. Additionally, plaintiffs have filed a letter
4 requesting an extension of time in which Ms. Goutevenier refers to the motion filed by
5 Mr. Helmy, emphasizes the “irreconcilable conflict” and explains that she “did not fully
6 come to understand the implications of the conflict of interest between [herself] and Mr.
7 Helmy until this past weekend.” Dkt. # 67. Given that plaintiffs directed Mr. Helmy to
8 withdraw, Ms. Goutevenier herself has requested withdrawal, and she specifically refers
9 to the motion filed, the court finds that she had notice of the motion, and withdrawal of
10 counsel is appropriate. For all the foregoing reasons, the court GRANTS Mr. Helmy’s
11 motion to withdraw as counsel, and Mr. Helmy and his firm are DISCHARGED as
12 counsel for plaintiffs. Mr. Helmy is DIRECTED to make the transition to new counsel as
13 easy as possible by, among other things, transferring files, records, etc. in an expeditious
14 manner.

15 With respect to the motion for extension of time, the court finds good cause to
16 grant the extension given the timing of the court’s order granting defendant’s special
17 motion to strike (December 4), Ms. Goutevenier’s apparent discovery of the
18 irreconcilable conflict with her attorney (weekend prior to December 11), the date her
19 response to the Rule 37 motion was due (December 10), and new counsel’s apparent
20 engagement (within a few days of December 19). For all the foregoing reasons, the court
21 GRANTS plaintiffs’ motion for extension of time as follows:

22 1. Given the court’s heavy docket and trial schedule, the court will set trial for
23 August 19, 2013.

24 2. New counsel shall enter an appearance no later than January 15, 2013.

25 3. Plaintiffs’ response to defendants’ Rule 37 motion is due January 28, 2013.

26 Defendants’ reply is due February 1, 2013. The Clerk is DIRECTED to renote
27 defendants’ Rule 37 motion for February 1, 2013. Dkt. # 54.

4. Plaintiffs may file their reply in support of their motion to compel no later than January 28, 2013. Defendants may respond to plaintiffs' reply, and will specifically reference this order if they choose to do so no later than February 1, 2013. The Clerk is DIRECTED to renote the motion to compel for February 1, 2013. Dkt. # 56.

5. Plaintiffs may respond to defendants' motion for attorney's fees no later than January 28, 2013. Defendants may reply no later than February 1, 2013. The Clerk is DIRECTED to remote defendants' motion for attorney's fees for February 1, 2013.

6. The new deadline for dispositive motions shall be May 30, 2013. The Clerk is DIRECTED to TERMINATE defendants' motion for summary judgment. Dkt. # 68. Defendants may refile the motion for summary judgment consistent with this order.

7. The Clerk is DIRECTED to TERMINATE the motions for extension of time. Dkt. # 64, # 67.

8. The Clerk is DIRECTED to enter an amended case schedule consistent with this order.

Dated this 27th day of December, 2012.

Richard D. Jones

The Honorable Richard A. Jones
United States District Judge